



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NEW SECTIONALISM.

AT the present time we are hearing a good deal of a "new sectionalism" which is said to be arraying the West and South against the East. The line of division between the sections is not definite: an area of debatable ground is claimed by both sides. The states beyond the Mississippi show most clearly the characteristics of the new sectionalism. The South has been affected by local peculiarities,—notably by the presence of a large negro population,—but its general attitude has been one of sympathy and co-operation with the West. The states between the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Great Lakes form the debatable region. The East, which is the chief object of Western and Southern hostility, includes the New England and Middle states, with New York as a centre. Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Colorado, and Nevada have been most distinctly committed to the new doctrines. These states have been strongholds of the Populists. They have furnished most of the recruits for the industrial armies. They have contributed the principal support to the demand for the free coinage of silver. In the South, Alabama and South Carolina, and more lately North Carolina, have been the chief seats of the movement. The new sectionalism, therefore, represents a cleavage among the states which divides the older and wealthier states of the East from the younger, less populous, and less wealthy states of the West and South. A line drawn from the source of the Mississippi to its junction with the Ohio, thence up the Ohio to the south-west corner of Pennsylvania, and along the southern boundary of Pennsylvania and of Maryland to the Atlantic, marks in a general way the boundary between the sections. Sixteen states, with a population of 32 millions, comprise the

East, and twenty-eight states, with a population of 30 millions, the West and South,—an almost equal division of the people between the sections. Such an estimate gives to the East the debatable ground contained in the five Central states. With the threefold division we should have the following: the East with eleven states and a population of over 18 millions; the doubtful states, five in number and with over 13 million people; and the West and South with twenty-eight states and 30 millions.

The chief characteristics of this new sectionalism have been: hostility to railways; belief in an irredeemable paper money issued by the federal government; demand for the free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1; hostility to banks of all kinds; opposition to the issue of bonds; and demand for an income tax to force the holders of great wealth to contribute, according to their ability, to the needs of the government. The attitude of the West and South has been made clear in their support of the income tax, and in their defeat of all the efforts of the present administration to obtain the consent of Congress to the issue of bonds. The chaotic condition of politics during recent years is chiefly explicable as a result of the disturbing effect of the new sectionalism. The purpose of this paper is to describe the new movement, to estimate its real strength, and to make some forecast as to its future.

The two organizations which represent most completely the ideas of the new sectionalism are the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist party. The Farmers' Alliance first attracted the attention of the public through the influence that it exerted in the congressional and state elections of 1890. It was composed of a number of societies formed among the farmers during the years immediately preceding 1889. A union was arranged during that year; and in December a general convention was held at St. Louis,

at which the name was changed to the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, and headquarters were opened at Washington. A plan of confederation with the Knights of Labor was adopted, and friendly greetings exchanged with the single tax party. The formation of a new party out of the Alliance, the Knights of Labor, and other elements, was discussed, and a call issued for a conference at Cincinnati in 1891.

Early in 1890 the Alliance began to exert political power. The local branches, established originally for the discussion of measures beneficial to the farmer, became political caucuses. Crop failures and low prices in the years just preceding 1890 favored this transformation. The result was a campaign "the most thrilling ever known in the West." In the South, also, the Alliance made itself felt; but its influence was not so striking there, for it sided with the Democrats, while in the West it worked independently. In November, 1890, the Farmers elected governors in Georgia, Texas, South Dakota, and South Carolina, carried State tickets in Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota, and elected a number of Congressmen. The national convention of 1890 was held just after these victories, and it was not remarkable that its leaders should be jubilant over their successes. The results of the elections encouraged the advocates of independent political action, and another call for a convention was issued. The initial steps were thus taken for the formation of the People's Party, which played so important a part in the election of 1892. The new party was formed in May, 1891, the component elements being the Alliance, various labor organizations, the single tax men, and the Nationalists. The influence of the Nationalists has been to give to the movement more of a socialist flavor than it would otherwise have possessed. Arrangements were made for a national convention in 1892, to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency.

The convention met in Omaha early in July, 1892. After vainly trying to induce the late Secretary W. Q. Gresham, of Illinois, to accept a nomination, it nominated General Weaver, of Iowa, for President. The platform demanded: (1) the union of rural and civic labor; (2) government ownership of railroads, and civil service reform; (3) a national currency based on the Sub-treasury plan of the Farmers' Alliance "or a better system"; (4) the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; (5) the increase of the currency to \$50 per capita; (6) a graduated income tax; (7) economical administration; (8) the establishment of postal savings-banks; (9) government ownership of telegraphs and telephones; (10) the reclaiming of land held for speculation and the prohibition of alien ownership. In the election that followed 1,041,041 votes were cast for its candidates, giving to the party twenty-two votes in the electoral college, and dividing these votes for the first time since 1860 among three candidates. Not before, in the period since the Civil War, had a third party succeeded in securing for its candidates a place in the electoral college.

The successes of 1892 gave to the new party a position which it had not occupied before, although the remarkable election of 1890 had attracted attention to the new factor in politics. The representation in Congress, won first in 1890, was considerably strengthened after 1892. The two Populist senators, Peffer of Kansas and Kyle of South Dakota, were re-enforced by the election of Senator Allen, of Nebraska, and by the transfer of Senator Stewart of Nevada from the Republican side to the Populist ranks. In the House the number of representatives was raised to about a dozen. The influence of the new party was increased by the effect of its successes upon the two old parties. Both the Democratic and Republican parties felt obliged to conciliate the new power. This "permeating" influence has been the strongest positive force exer-

cised by the Populist party. Through this influence they have affected legislation much beyond what their representatives could directly accomplish. This indirect action, therefore, makes it much more difficult to estimate accurately their real strength. If we regard merely the work of their official representatives, their strength will seem very small; while, if we try to discover the way in which the policy of the two old parties has been influenced by them, we shall have to give to the Populists a considerable importance.

The most striking instance of "permeation" on the part of the Populists has been the adoption by the Democratic party of the income-tax demand. The latter, with full control of all the departments at Washington, came into power upon a platform that demanded a revenue tariff. Nothing had happened since the election to make necessary a change of the policy then announced. Yet the Democratic party incorporated in its tariff proposal an income-tax system of which not a trace is to be found in the platform on which it had appealed to the voters. This new feature survived all the changes to which the new tariff was subjected, in spite of the opposition of members of both parties from the East. Populism has affected not one party, but both; as is shown by the vote in the Senate on Senator Hill's motion to strike out the income-tax section. The vote was: yeas, 23; nays, 40. The yea column was made up of three Democrats (Hill and Murphy of New York and Smith of New Jersey) and twenty Republicans. The nays included three Populists (Allen, Kyle, and Peffer), six Republicans (Hansborough of North Dakota, Mitchell of Oregon, Pettigrew of South Dakota, Carr of Montana, Shoup of Idaho, and Teller of Colorado), and thirty-one Democrats. The progress made by Populist permeation of the old parties in regard to the free coinage of silver is difficult to estimate. The "free silver" sentiment at Washington is strong, and has been

little affected by the defeats of the past two years. With every Populist, nine-tenths of the Democrats, and one-half of the Republicans of the West devoted to the idea, there is need of very little assistance from the East to make possible the passage of a free coinage bill.

There were indications a year or two ago of a possible change of sentiment in the East. The formation of a society in Boston in favor of bimetallism, under the leadership of President Walker of the Institute of Technology and President Andrews of Brown University, seemed for a time to promise substantial aid to the silver cause.* The proposition by Senator Lodge to embark upon free coinage on the theory that by threats of tariff legislation against other nations we could compel them to join us in a bimetallist policy, and the interview with ex-Speaker Reed published in the *Fortnightly Review*,† at about the same time, pointed in that direction. In Pennsylvania there has been some coquetting with silver on the part of Senator Cameron. Pennsylvania is also the home of ex-Congressman Sibley, who has recently made a tour of the West as a presidential candidate of the silver party. On the whole, however, there is every indication of a sharper division of opinion between the East and the West upon the money question. The business world is opposed to change, and agitation in the West is more likely to solidify Eastern opinion against silver than to modify it in its favor.

In another way the Populists gained during the last Congress. The divisions in the Democratic party made it difficult to hold its majority together. The narrow majority in the Senate made the support of the Populists welcome from time to time. Moreover, the Republicans were anxious to win Populist votes, as, with their aid, it

* See the article by President Andrews on *The Bimetallist Committee of Boston and New England*, in this *Journal* for April, 1894, vol. viii. p. 319.

† For June, 1894.

was possible to overcome the Democratic majority. The exigencies of party politics have resulted in giving to the representatives of the new ideas a recognized position not often accorded to a third party. This advantage remains with them in the present Senate, owing to the failure of either the Republicans or Democrats to obtain a majority. The Populists therefore occupy an even more commanding position than in the last Senate; for without them neither party can carry its measures. In the last Senate there were forty-four Democrats, thirty-six Republicans, five Populists, and three vacancies. The new Senate contains forty-three Republicans, thirty-nine Democrats, and six Populists. Even the two new senators from Utah will not give the Republicans secure control. The six Populists are Peffer of Kansas, Allen of Nebraska, Stewart and Jones of Nevada, Kyle of South Dakota, and Butler of North Carolina. In addition there are Senators Irby and Tillman, of South Carolina, who may call themselves Democrats, but have strong and undisguised Populist sympathies. Senator Pritchard, of North Carolina, was elected senator as a result of the Republican-Populist combination in that state at the election of 1894. The Populists thus form a compact little group, able to dictate to both the old parties. Their strength is increased by the well-known sympathy of a number of other senators with their views.

Of the character and ability of the members of the new party in the last Congress a recent writer has said :* "In a session [1893-94] when absenteeism has been most scandalous, and when the party in power, despite its overwhelming majority, has for weeks together found it well-nigh impossible to secure a quorum, the little band of Populists have been in their seats, and have attended, to the best of their ability and knowledge, to the legitimate interests of the nation and of their constituents. . . . If,

* Albert Shaw, in the *Review of Reviews*, July, 1894.

on the one hand, they have shown no transcendent ability as statesmen, orators, or parliamentarians, they have, on the other hand, maintained an exceedingly good average in these regards. Very few of them could, by any possibility, be regarded as belonging to the politician class. Speaking generally, they may be said to be fair representatives of the honest, well-intentioned citizenship of the states from which they came."

Senator William V. Allen, the Populist senator from Nebraska, came to Washington at the opening of the special session in August, 1893. He had never been a politician, and had held no political office. He was born in Ohio forty-six years ago. When young Allen was ten years old, the family removed to Iowa. Four years later the war broke out. After an unsuccessful effort to enlist, he succeeded in 1862, and served for three years. At the end of the war he returned to Iowa and to his studies; and after some time spent in attending school, teaching, and reading law, he was admitted to the bar. He practised for a time in Iowa, and in ten years removed to Madison, Nebraska, a village of fifteen hundred people.

In 1891 he received the Populist nomination for district judge, and was elected by a good majority. He had left the Republican party in 1890. As the result of the election of 1892, Mr. Allen was elected senator from Nebraska. Of his election a hostile critic has said: * "In spite of all opposition, they elected, by the aid of the Democrats, W. V. Allen to the Senate. The election cost Mr. Allen just \$74.25. He is a Populist; but he is a conservative, pure, incorruptible man, who won renown as a just, upright judge and eminent attorney." In the Senate Senator Allen has distinguished himself for his opposition to the repeal of the silver purchase law and for his support of the rights of Coxey and his followers. During

* In the *Forum* for May, 1893.

the continuous session of October, 1893, he made a speech that occupied a little more than fifteen consecutive hours in its delivery. He began at five o'clock in the afternoon of October 11, and pronounced his closing sentences at a little after eight on the following morning. As to the constitutional rights of Coxey and his men, Senator Allen held "that these people were peaceful citizens coming to the Capitol on a lawful errand, and that, as petitioners, they were entitled to a hearing upon the grievances they had come so far to declare." He favored the resolution of Senator Peffer, that a select committee of the Senate should be appointed to receive and listen to Mr. Coxey and his followers; and he made a sharp protest against the police preparations that were brought into requisition in the District of Columbia on account of the so-called invasion of the "industrial" armies. At the same time he disclaimed any connection with the Coxey movement or any sympathy with its methods.

The comparative strength of the Populists in the various states is by no means clearly indicated by the vote for Populist electors for President in 1892. These figures furnish only a general estimate; for the returns of votes for candidates other than those of the leading parties are not carefully made, and are variously classified in different states. The following table, based upon figures prepared by Mr. W. J. Ghent, of New York City, gives careful estimates made from the best attainable data of the real Populist strength in 1892 and 1894. The Republican and Democratic papers slighted the new party, while Populist papers made most extravagant claims. In South Carolina the Populists are credited in 1894 with the Tillman Democratic vote, as no Populist ticket was run, and the Tillmanites stood on an avowedly Populist platform.

ACTUAL POPULIST VOTE IN 1892 AND 1894.

<i>West.</i>	<i>1892.</i>	<i>1894.</i>	<i>South.</i>	<i>1892</i>	<i>1894.</i>
Colorado	40,000	74,894	Texas	99,688	175,000
South Dakota	26,544	26,568	Mississippi	10,256	12,096
Kansas	115,000	118,329	Georgia	42,937	96,888
Nebraska	61,326	69,883	Alabama	42,600	83,283
Idaho	4,865	7,121	North Carolina	44,736	70,000
Washington	19,165	24,983	Florida	4,843	5,750
Oregon	15,000	25,461	Louisiana	13,281	5,376
North Dakota	7,000	8,794	Tennessee	23,477	23,092
Nevada	2,000	2,771	Kentucky	23,500	17,363
Montana	7,334	15,251	Arkansas	11,831	24,541
Minnesota	29,313	87,931	Virginia	12,275	10,330
California	25,352	55,237	South Carolina	2,407	39,586
Missouri	41,213	42,463	West Virginia	4,166	3,407
Wyoming	1,500	2,176			
Iowa	20,595	34,859			
Indiana	22,208	29,388			
Michigan	19,892	30,012			
Illinois	22,207	60,066			
Ohio	14,850	49,495			
Wisconsin	9,909	25,604			
New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland				33,881	53,717
Territorial vote				4,348	22,648
Total vote				879,469	1,434,253
Increase					554,784

The strength of the Populists, as compared with the old parties, is indicated by the following figures, which give the percentage of the total state vote cast for Populist candidates, based upon the figures of the preceding table. In each case the total state vote of 1892 is taken as a basis. The New England states, and New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware, are omitted from the comparison.

<i>West.</i>	<i>1892</i>	<i>1894.</i>	<i>South</i>	<i>1892</i>	<i>1894.</i>
Colorado	44%	81%	Texas	23%	41%
South Dakota	37	37	Mississippi	20	23
Kansas	36	37	Georgia	20	43
Nebraska	31½	35	Alabama	18	36
Idaho	28	38	North Carolina	16	25
Washington	22½	28	Florida	12	17
Oregon	20	33½	Louisiana	11	4
North Dakota	20	23	Tennessee	9	9
Nevada	19	20	Kentucky	7	5
Montana	16½	35	Arkansas	7	16½

<i>West.</i>	<i>1892.</i>	<i>1894.</i>	<i>South.</i>	<i>1892.</i>	<i>1894.</i>
Minnesota	12	34	Virginia	4	3
California	10	21	South Carolina	3	56
Missouri	7½	7½	West Virginia	2	—
Wyoming	6	13			
Iowa	5	7			
Indiana	4	5½			
Michigan	4	6½			
Illinois	2½	7			
Ohio	1½	5			
Wisconsin	—	7			

The elections of 1894 resulted in the defeat of the Populists in most of the Western states in which they had had great success in 1892. These defeats, as the figures show, were not caused by a falling off in strength: they were due to local influences and political complications. Although they lost the governorship in Kansas, their vote increased from 115,000 in 1892 to 118,329 in 1894. In Oregon, although the erratic Pennoyer was defeated, the Populist vote increased from 15,000 to 25,461. The election of a Populist governor in Nebraska, on the other hand, was hardly due to an increase of Populist strength, but was chiefly the result of a bad nomination on the part of the Republicans. The great gains made were in the South. South Carolina elected as governor a Tillman Democrat, while Tillman himself was sent to the United States Senate. The Tillman Democracy received nearly 40,000 votes out of a total of less than 70,000. They adopted the Ocala platform of the Farmers' Alliance, asserting that its demands were not inconsistent with those of the Chicago platform of the national Democracy. A fusion of Republicans and Populists in North Carolina resulted in the election of an anti-Democratic legislature and the sending to Washington of one Republican and one Populist senator,—two Populists with Republican affiliations. In Texas, too, a Republican-Populist fusion succeeded in electing two Congressmen. In Alabama a similar fusion resulted in the election of a Republican Congressman. The Populist vote in Minnesota showed

a remarkable increase from 29,313 in 1892 to 87,931 in 1894. In California the Populists developed extraordinary strength. Their vote ran from 45,749 for their weakest candidate to 68,000 for their strongest candidate. For attorney-general the Populist vote was only a little over 14,000 behind the Democratic. The campaign was characterized by extreme hostility to the Southern Pacific Railway monopoly, and the Democratic programme was avowedly for government control of the Central and Union Pacific Railroads. The Democratic candidate for governor, Mr. Budd, offered as a practical policy the taking of these roads by the federal government and their management as government highways, over which, under proper regulations, any railroad might run its cars. This policy was peculiarly his own, for he originated it ten years before while a member of Congress. He stumped the state upon this issue, the first instance of a campaign conducted by one of the leading parties in this country in favor of government control of railroads. It was chiefly due to the popularity of such a policy that a Democratic governor was elected in California in the face of general Democratic defeat.

The relative strength of the chief ideas of the new sectionalism in the different states is shown in the following table. For purposes of comparison the states are divided into four groups,—Western, Southern, Central, and Eastern. The Western states are those west of the Mississippi, and north of and including Missouri and Kansas. The Southern are those south of and including Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Texas. The Central states are Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The Eastern include the New England states and New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland.

For convenience of comparison the votes indicative of the same opinions are put into the same column, whether

they happen to be yes or no on the particular proposition under consideration.*

WESTERN.

Free Coinage	June 25, 1890	For 26	Against 21
"	Aug 28, 1893	" 38	" 27
Repeal Bill	Oct 30, 1893	Against 18	For 9
Income Tax	Feb 1, 1894	For 36	Against 0
Gold Bonds	Feb. 14, 1895	" 10	" 52

SOUTHERN.

Free Coinage	June 25, 1890	For 74	Against 14
"	Aug 28, 1893	" 70	" 29
Repeal Bill	Oct. 30, 1893	Against 18	For 8
Income Tax	Feb 1, 1894	For 96	Against 3
Gold Bonds	Feb. 14, 1895	" 24	" 64

CENTRAL.

Free Coinage	June 25, 1890	For 24	Against 36
"	Aug 28, 1893	" 14	" 60
Repeal Bill	Oct. 30, 1893	Against 0	For 10
Income Tax	Feb. 1, 1894	For 43	Against 1
Gold Bonds	Feb. 14, 1895	" 22	" 41

EASTERN.

Free Coinage	June 25, 1890	For 8	Against 79
"	Aug. 28, 1893	" 1	" 99
Repeal Bill	Oct 30, 1893	Against 1	For 21
Income Tax	Feb. 1, 1894	For 5	Against 42
Gold Bonds	Feb. 14, 1895	" 64	" 11

An examination of these figures shows that in the Western states there is a majority for free coinage of silver; that, as represented in the Senate, these states were opposed two to one to the repeal of the silver purchase clause of the Sherman act; that they are unanimous for the levying of an income tax; and that they are against the issue of gold bonds more than five to one. The Southern states are even more strongly in favor of free coinage than the Western, slightly more opposed to repeal, almost unanimous for the income tax, and nearly three to one against gold bonds. The Central states have a small ma-

*Except in the case of the Repeal Bill, the figures are of votes in the House.

jority against free coinage, unanimously supported repeal, are almost unanimous for an income tax, and are opposed to the issue of gold bonds, though less strongly opposed than the West and the South. In the Eastern states we find almost complete unanimity against free coinage, in favor of repeal, great opposition to an income tax, and strong support of gold bonds. The sectional division is clear. The Eastern states are opposed to the West and South, while the Central states occupy an intermediate position. The Eastern states cast but one vote for free coinage in 1893, this one vote being cast by Congressman Sibley, of Pennsylvania, before referred to as a silver candidate for the Presidency. The same state gave the only Eastern vote against repeal. On the other hand, the West and South are practically unanimous for an income tax; while the East cast only five votes in its favor,—three from Pennsylvania, one from Massachusetts, and one from Connecticut. The Central states agree with the West and South in this respect as well as in regard to the issue of gold bonds, while as to free coinage and repeal they take sides with the East. The less thickly settled parts of the country favor free coinage and an income tax, and oppose repeal and gold bonds. The Senate has shown itself more friendly to the ideas of the new sectionalism than has the House, for the equal representation of the states in the former body gives to the less populous states an advantage there. Hence the long struggle in the Senate over repeal, and the repeated passage of free coinage bills by the same body. Wherever there are large centres of population, there is a noticeable hostility to free coinage and an income tax. The two representatives from California who voted against free coinage in 1893 were from San Francisco and Oakland. The only votes from Missouri against free coinage came from St. Louis, and in Alabama the only opposition came from the district in which Mobile is situated.

Sectional ideas have broken through party lines. Questions of finance and taxation have been supported or opposed not according to party divisions, but according to sectional feeling. Both parties have suffered from these influences. Democrats in the East have voted in opposition to the majority of their party, while Republicans in the West have followed a similar course.* In August,

*The record of certain important votes cast in Congress during the past few years is as follows :—

FREE COINAGE, AUGUST 28, 1893

	<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>	
Total	101 Dem., 13 Rep., 11 Pop.	111 Rep.,	116 Dem.
Western	18	9	11
Southern	70	—	—
Central	12	2	—
Eastern	1	—	—
		23	4
		4	25
		29	30
		53	46

REPEAL BILL, OCTOBER 30, 1893.

	<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>	
Total	21 Dem., 27 Rep.	11 Rep.,	23 Dem., 3 Pop.
Western	—	9	10
Southern	8	—	—
Central	6	4	—
Eastern	7	14	1
		5	3
		18	—
		—	—
		—	—

GOLD BONDS, FEBRUARY 14, 1895.

	<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>	
Total	90 Dem., 30 Rep.	61 Rep.,	96 Dem , 11 Pop.
Western	8	2	26
Southern	24	—	2
Central	17	5	24
Eastern	41	23	9
		15	11
		62	—
		17	—
		2	—

The present state of the sectional conflict in Congress is shown by the votes upon free coinage during February, 1896. February 1 the Senate passed a free coinage substitute for the House Bond Bill by a vote of 48 to 41, including pairs. The attitude of parties and sections is indicated by the following table:—

	<i>For</i>	<i>Against.</i>	
Total	24 Dem , 18 Rep., 6 Pop.	15 Dem.,	26 Rep.
Western	4	16	5
Southern	18	1	1
Central	2	—	—
Eastern	—	1	—
		5	1
		4	4
		6	14

February 14 the House non-concurred in the Senate substitute by a vote of 215 to 90. The vote was as follows:—

1893, the Democratic vote was almost equally divided for and against free coinage; while a minority of Republicans joined with the Democrats in favor of free coinage. It was significant that one hundred and one Democratic votes were cast for an amendment opposed by a Democratic majority and by a Democratic President. On the vote for repeal in the Senate the Democratic vote was almost equally divided; while twenty-seven Republicans voted for repeal, and eleven against it. The vote on gold bonds in February, 1895, indicated an even more demoralized condition of parties. A majority of Democrats voted against a policy proposed by the Democratic administration, and known to be of the greatest importance to the national credit. The leader of the Republicans also failed to control his party, sixty-one Republicans voting against him.

Such facts as these throw light upon the present and recent demoralization of parties in Congress, and make more clear the reasons why so little has been accomplished by the legislative branch of the government. The questions before Congress have been questions upon which sectional feelings differ widely. The House contains a majority of representatives who favor Eastern views as to

	<i>Against.</i>			<i>For.</i>	
Total	58 Dem.,	25 Rep.,	7 Pop.	31 Dem.	184 Rep.
Western	3	17	4	3	31
Southern	52	4	2	19	12
Central	2	3	—	1	64
Eastern	—	—	—	8	77

The decrease of 35 in the free coinage vote from that cast in the House in August, 1893, is due largely to changes in the States lying along the border of the sections,—in Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee. In Missouri a vote of 12 to 2 for free coinage became one of 11 to 1 against. The Kentucky vote, evenly divided in 1893, was unanimous against in 1896. In Tennessee a majority for became a majority against in 1896. The sectional rather than the party character of these votes is illustrated by California, where the vote of 5 to 2 for free coinage in 1893 became a unanimous one of 7 in 1896, while the party composition of the State delegation changed from a majority of Democrats to a strong majority of Republicans. In North Carolina the vote, unchanged from 1893, of 8 to 1 for free coinage was made up almost equally of Republicans, Democrats, and Populists.

free coinage and repeal, while there is at the same time a majority for an income tax and in opposition to gold bonds. The Senate has a majority favorable to free coinage and an income tax, and opposed to repeal. The President is a strong representative of Eastern ideas. Briefly, the House is divided between representatives of the sections, the Senate is largely representative of the West and South, while the President represents the East. With such a balance of powers we need not be surprised that little progress is made. The same situation offers an explanation for the lack of harmony in the Democratic party. That party, relying as it does for much of its strength upon the South, feels very strongly the dividing influences of sectional feeling. The failure of the majority in the House and Senate to follow the lead of the administration is to be accounted for mainly by the growth of sectional differences. The new sectionalism is the key to an understanding of the existing political situation.

Now that we have completed our review of the influences that have been at work in the West and South during recent years, we are in a position to draw some general conclusions as to the nature of these movements. The first feature that attracts attention is the importance of the part played by the government in the development of the life and thought of the West. The free silver demand illustrates this. It comes from the issue of greenbacks by the government during the war. That act gave birth to the greenback party, the parent of the free silver party. Federal legislation, too, in regard to the West has tended to magnify the importance of government in the eyes of the people. From the beginning the government has done everything. The men who settled the West after the war settled on government lands, saw the great land grants to the railroads, saw, above all, the Union Pacific built by a government endowment of a land grant, and by a loan of \$50,000,000 for construction. The great exten-

sion in the powers and influence of the federal government that began with the outbreak of the Civil War continued in the years following its close, and the development of this tendency has been contemporaneous with the life of the West. The tariff, currency, pensions, public improvements, have all contributed to the same end,—the magnifying of the share of the state in the every-day life of the people. The policy of the government has therefore been responsible for the development of special movements and of special demands. It has also been responsible for the development of that attitude on the part of the people which makes them look to the government for everything,—an attitude noticeable all over the country, but nowhere so marked as in the West and South.

Another set of influences that have been at work result from the industrial relations of the East and West. The West, as a new country, destitute of capital, has looked to the East for assistance. Its needs, coupled with the prospects of future profits, have led the West to agree to terms rather hard. The inevitable result has been some feeling of injustice when the terms of agreement are insisted upon. The conflict of interest came between the debtor and the creditor. The debtor felt the creditor was too insistent for his pound of flesh. The creditor became suspicious of the integrity of his debtor. Extend this relation from the individual to the community, and introduce a certain not inconsiderable element of corruption, and you have the present relations between the sections, with the recurrent cries of Wall Street conspiracy and the money power. Remember, too, that the beginnings of the indebtedness were made in a period of inflation, while the payments come after the return to a specie basis. Furthermore, the currencies of the world are in a state of confusion as a result of the decline in the price of silver. We need not be surprised at the appearance of a cleavage between the sections whose relations are mainly those of debtor and creditor.

Still another set of influences have been at work. These are the changes in the general economic conditions in the United States, as a result of the remarkable material development of the country. The settlement of the West has not gone on regularly throughout the past thirty years: it has advanced irregularly by fits and starts. A period of extraordinary activity has been followed by one of quiet. Population has gone West too fast, and has had to wait for the general movement to catch up with it. A boom has been followed by a collapse, the collapse usually leading to an outbreak such as the Granger movement. After each collapse there have remained still more lands to occupy, and the process has continued. Now, however, the settlement of the West is reaching a stage where no more lands are left to occupy. A more permanent condition of things is approaching. The West must face the conditions of a settled country. The margin of land is reduced to a minimum. The pinch of this new situation is beginning to be felt, and is making the movements resulting from the crop failures of 1887 to 1890 seem more serious. The same situation makes it probable that the unrest will be more lasting. The co-operation of the South with the West is easily understood, if we remember that the South, as well as the West, has been undergoing a rapid economic development since the end of the Civil War. The existence of slavery down to 1865 retarded the growth of that section, so that its transformation has been exceedingly rapid for the past generation. Manufactures have been established, railroads built, mineral resources developed. The aristocratic system of the Old South under slavery has given place to the democratic industrial system of the New South. The same difficulties, and even greater, have been encountered in the transition that have been experienced in the West. Hence the appearance of similar movements and of similar demands for the removal of grievances.

In the influence of the policy of the federal government, in the industrial relations of the East with the West and South, and in the economic changes that have come from the closer settlement of the West and the industrial transformation of the South, we have the principal influences that have produced the new sectionalism. But, in addition to these industrial and economic conditions, there are other causes that deserve attention. Among the more important of these are the corruption of the old parties,* the rise of a new democracy, and the avoidance of live issues by the leading parties. The different political affiliations of the Populists in the West and South illustrate this aspect of the movement. In the West, where the Republicans have been for many years the majority party, the Populists have united usually with the Democrats; while in the South, where the Democrats have been the dominant party, the Populists have fused with the Republicans. In Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa, strong Republican states ever since the Civil War, we find a fusion of the Democrats and Populists. In Alabama, Texas, and North Carolina, on the other hand, the Republicans and Populists have united. These attempts have had more success in the South than in the West. The greatest victory was

*The following passage in the Populist platform adopted at Omaha in 1892 is significant.—

"Corruption dominates the ballot-box, the legislatures, the Congress, and touches even the ermine of the Bench. The people are demoralized. Most of the states have been compelled to isolate the voters at the polling places to prevent universal intimidation or bribery. . . . We have witnessed for more than a quarter of a century the struggles of the two great political parties for power and plunder, while grievous wrongs have been inflicted upon the suffering people. We charge that the controlling influences dominating both these parties have permitted the existing dreadful conditions to develop without serious effort to prevent or restrain them. Neither do they now promise any substantial reform. They have agreed together to ignore in the coming campaign every issue but one. They propose to drown the outcries of a plundered people with the uproar of a sham battle over the tariff, so that capitalists, corporations, national banks, rings, trusts, watered stock, the demonetization of silver, and the oppressions of the usurers, may all be lost sight of."

won in North Carolina in 1894, when the fusionists carried the legislature, and elected two United States senators. The absorption of the Populists by the Democrats in South Carolina is hardly an exception; for the Tillmanite section of the Democratic party in that state is especially hostile to the older wing, which represents the power and prestige of the ruling aristocracy. The Tillman Democracy is really Populistic in its character: its political affiliations are produced by local conditions. Thus the Populists have been both in the West and in the South hostile to the party in power, responsible as it always must be for the corruption that creeps into a state in which one party has been for a long time dominant.

The rise of a new democracy requires some further comment. It is a very general opinion that we have had a perfectly democratic government ever since 1776. During the early years of the republic the government of the country was in the hands of the aristocracies of Virginia and New England, of which Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and the Adamses were the leaders. While theoretically sovereign, the people at large were "deferential" enough (to use a phrase of Bagehot's) to allow the control of affairs to remain in the hands of their superiors in birth and position. The first serious shock to this situation came with the advent to power in 1830 of Andrew Jackson. The great middle class, so called, the people with no pretension to birth and with no inherited wealth, were gradually roused to a point where they demanded a voice in public affairs. From 1830 to 1865 large classes, before indifferent or unable to exert an influence, began to take an effective part in governmental affairs. All property qualifications, such as existed in the early days of the republic, were swept away. Legally, there was a government of the people. Nevertheless, there remained large classes who were unable to exert any real influence upon politics. The years since 1865 have

witnessed the gradual coming to political consciousness of these long silent classes. Economic and industrial changes, the results of popular education, and the growth to maturity of the children of the earlier immigrants from Europe, have all tended in the same direction. A similar development has been going on throughout the world. In the United States there are many indications that the great masses of the people, the working classes, are at length astir, and ready to take a real part in the control of the government. The true explanation of the so-called tidal waves of 1890, 1892, and 1894, is to be found in the participation of these classes, formerly without political influence. They show that the masses are now capable of forming opinions upon questions placed definitely before them, and have learned how to register those opinions at the polls. The passage of an unpopular tariff act was the chief cause of the tidal waves of 1890 and 1892, while in 1894 the people punished the Democrats for the disasters of 1893. The growth of labor organizations and the spread of socialistic agitation point in the same direction. The industrial armies of 1894 and the great strikes of recent years are results of the same cause. The Populist party derives its greatest strength from these very classes, hitherto unrepresented. Its rank and file are made up of the common people, and it is from their participation that it derives its great significance.

From another point of view the avoidance of live issues by the leading parties is responsible for the formation of independent movements. The great party organizations have long survived the issues they were formed to support. They have become mere machines for winning elections and keeping control of the offices. They refuse to risk anything by attempts to deal with pressing questions; and they prevent, by the very strength of their organization, the formation of new agencies. But the problems of the time become ever more insistent of attention.

They will not down at the frown of party leaders. They must be dealt with, and machinery must be provided for their solution. The strength of the demand is shown by the many fruitless efforts to discover methods of solving them. In spite of great obstacles, independent organizations are formed to advocate all sorts of remedies. The refusal of the great party organizations and of well-known men to touch the problems has left the task to organizations and leaders incompetent or insufficiently equipped for the work. Because the Republicans and Democrats decline to take up the pressing industrial problems, their solution is left to the Populists. And the Populists will deserve credit if they accomplish nothing more than to lead the great parties and their leaders to face these questions. With all their faults, they have the one great merit of recognizing that industrial problems are the problems of the hour in the United States, as in the rest of the world.

This aspect of the movement leads us to the consideration of the new sectionalism as the American counterpart of socialism in Europe. There occurred in 1892 general elections in the three leading countries of Europe,—England, France, and Germany. A significant feature in each of these elections was the important influence exerted by socialism. In Germany the Social-Democracy showed itself the strongest single party, returning sixty members to the Reichstag. In France the socialists first made their appearance as a leading party, with a strong representation in the Chamber of Deputies. In England the influence of the new socialism was first felt at a general election. The growing strength of socialism in Europe is thus an established fact. But in America it is generally supposed to have a slight hold. There is thought to be some natural opposition between socialism and the American spirit. We are said to be comparatively free from the great problems that vex the nations

of the Old World. It is assumed that socialism has not yet entered the domain of practical politics. I believe that such a position is untenable, and that Populism or, to use the broader term, the new sectionalism, embodies ideas and demands essentially like those made by the socialists in Europe. In brief, a study of the present situation in this country leads inevitably, it seems to me, to the conclusion that Populism is the American counterpart of socialism in Europe. Socialism has entered the field of practical politics through the appearance of a new sectionalism.

The organized efforts to advance socialism in the United States can be very briefly enumerated. These have been the Socialist Labor party, the Single Tax League, Nationalism, and Christian Socialism. The Socialist Labor party has exercised a considerable influence upon the labor movement. The most important influence, however, has come from the Single Tax, which has been an entering wedge for more radical reforms, and has prepared the way for the adoption of purely socialistic proposals,—and this in spite of the strong individualistic attitude of its leaders. Compared with the Single Tax, Nationalism has had a small effect. The relative importance of the two movements cannot be better indicated than by a comparison between the two books, *Progress and Poverty* and *Looking Backward*, which have respectively given rise to the movements. *Progress and Poverty* is an economic work which, after fifteen years of searching criticism, has taken its place upon the shelves of economists. *Looking Backward* is only one among the many Utopias that have been given to the world since the publication of the famous work of Sir Thomas More.

If these formal movements were all the influences at work in the United States in favor of socialism, the history would indeed be very brief; for there is little of a permanent character in any of them. As has been the

case with Nationalism, an extremely rapid growth would be followed by as rapid a collapse. Such movements are, like the Coxey Army, mere surface manifestations of a social unrest which is making itself felt along the line of least resistance. In my opinion, the most important indication of the growth of socialism in the United States is the appearance in the West and South of an unconscious socialism in the shape of Populism.

The unconscious socialism of the West and South is essentially a home product, very slightly influenced by foreign movements. It is a product of conditions that have grown up since the Civil War, and appears most strongly in the West and South, because there the conditions have been more favorable to its growth. The characteristic feature of Populism, already pointed out, is the importance that is attached to the action of government. It looks to the government for everything,—a feature of socialism wherever found. Populists may claim, as many of them do, that they are not socialists, and that they are opposed to socialism: the fact remains that their attitude is socialistic. Their demands are for government interference for the correction of evils. They believe the government can do better for individuals, in many cases, than the individuals can do for themselves. Furthermore, their proposals are the very ones advocated by socialists. The fact that they are undoubtedly the outgrowth of home conditions does not change their character. The demand for the government ownership of railroads, due to the abuses of railroad management, is a leading feature of the Populist platform. The hostility to banks, and the demand for the abolition of private banks, point in the same direction. The movement for the enlargement of the currency looks to the extension of governmental functions. Anti-corporation feeling regards government ownership and control as a panacea for all abuses. The reclamation of lands owned by corporations, by specula-

tors, and by aliens, is partial land nationalization. The Populist demand for income tax, adopted by the Democrats, is an item of importance in German and English socialistic programmes. The Coxey movement was merely one form of the demand for the exercise of government activity, applied to the most pressing need of the moment,—work for the unemployed. The Populists believe (in the words of their platform of 1892) "that the powers of government—in other words, of the people—should be expanded as rapidly and as far as the good sense of an intelligent people and the teachings of experience shall justify, to the end that oppression, injustice, and poverty shall eventually cease in the land."

Whatever may be the course of socialistic development in the United States in the future, and whether or no the Populist movement proves more permanent than those which it has succeeded, the signs are not wanting that the lines are now being drawn here, as elsewhere, in the conflict for economic emancipation which will fill the twentieth century, as the struggle for political freedom has filled the nineteenth. Every struggle between capital and labor leaves the lines more sharply drawn; and every severe outbreak, such as that of 1894, brings home to thoughtful persons the conclusion that the pressing questions of the day are industrial. Our statesmen and our men of leisure and education must face these problems, and undertake their solution. The tariff must give way to questions connected with transportation, with monopolies, with the relations of employer and employed, and the reform of taxation in such manner that accumulated wealth may pay its share of the expenses of government. A proper understanding of Populism, as a movement with historical foundations and allied to similar movements in other countries, will contribute to the desired end.

Finally, the question arises as to whether the new sec-

tionalism is to be permanent, and what is to be its influence in our national life? I trust that I have made clear that it represents something more than the mere vagary of disordered and discontented minds, that it has its roots in the past, and that it has arisen because of real grievances. The West and South have passed through a period of rapid economic development, and in the course of this development certain evils have appeared. As a result, we have complaints and recriminations. The West and South are the debtors of the East, and regard that section as grasping and avaricious. The East, having suffered frequent loss, naturally looks at the West and South as debtors anxious to avoid payment of just debts. Hence arises the Western idea of the money power, in which England and the East are represented as grasping usurers, bent on the enslavement of the world. Contrasted with this idea is the equally mistaken Eastern view of the West and South as filled with persons possessed of wild and fanatical ideas on industry and government. The hope of the future lies in a clear understanding of one section by the other, and a cordial union between them for the reform of existing abuses. Under such a union Populism will disappear, and sectionalism will cease to disturb our politics. By such a course alone can the new sectionalism pass away peacefully, leaving none of the scars and burdens still remaining to us from the great conflict by which the older sectionalism of North and South was destroyed.

FREDERICK EMORY HAYNES.